DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 829 TM 006 322

AUTHOR Kieckhaefer, William F.
TITLE Effect of Human Relations Training on Racial Attitudes of Marines.
INSTITUTION Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, Calif.
REPORT NO NPRDC-TR-76-TQ-42
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Tests; Blacks; Caucasians; *Educational Programs; Evaluation Methods; Military Personnel; Post Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Differences; *Sensitivity Training
IDENTIFIERS Marine Corps; *Situational Attitude Scale; *Social Distance Scale

ABSTRACT

Tests and methodologies were developed to measure both the racial attitudes of Marines and the effects of training at the Marine Corps Human Relations Institute (HRI) on those attitudes. A pilot test of a Social Distance Scale (SDS) and a Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) revealed that two types of racial bias occurred on the SDS: positive/negative racial attitudes and interracial/intraracial bias. In line with the purpose of the HRI training program, it was hypothesized that the training would affect a decrease in both types of bias on both measures of racial attitudes. Positive and negative interracial biases on the SDS decreased more for both white and black trainees than for the white control group. Postive and negative interracial biases decreased more than the control group only for white trainees. Consistent with previous research, no significant effect of training occurred on the SAS. However, white trainees who were biased on the SDS were significantly biased in the same way on the SAS. The Social Distance Scale and Situational Attitude Scale and their scoring keys are appended. (Author/MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AFHRL-TR-78-10-AD AUGUST 1978

EFFECT OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING ON RACIAL ATTITUDES OF MARINES

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

NPRDC TR 76TQ-42 August 1976

EFFECT OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING ON RACIAL ATTITUDES OF MARINES

William F. Kieckhaefer

Reviewed by
Robert Penn

Approved by
James J. Regan
Technical Director

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92152

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER: NPRDC TR TQ76-42
2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.:
3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER:

4. TITLE (and Subtitle): EFFECT OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING ON RACIAL ATTITUDES OF MARINES

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: Final Report January 1974 to April 1974

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER:

7. AUTHOR(s): William F. Kieckhaefer

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s):

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California 92152

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS:

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California 92152

12. REPORT DATE: August 1976

13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 46

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office):

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report): UNCLASSIFIED

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE:

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report): Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report):

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number):
Human Relations Training
Social Distance
Situational Attitude
Interracial Bias
Intraracial Bias
Positive Bias
Negative Bias

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number):

The purpose of this study was to develop tests and methodologies to measure both racial attitudes of Marines and the effect of training at the Marine Corps Human Relations Institute (HRI) on those attitudes. A pilot test of a Social Distance Scale (SDS) and a Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) revealed that two types of racial bias occurred on the SDS: positive/negative racial attitudes and interracial/intraracial bias. In line with the purpose of the HRI training program, it was hypothesized that the training would affect a decrease in both types of bias on both measures of racial attitudes.

Positive and negative intraracial biases on the SDS decreased more for both white and black trainees than for the white control group. Positive and negative interracial biases decreased more than the control group only for white trainees. Consistent with previous research, no significant effect of training occurred on the SAS. However, white trainees who were biased on the SDS were significantly biased in the same way on the SAS.

FOREWORD

This development was initiated in response to a request from Headquarters, Marine Corps (Code MPE). The purpose was to determine the effect of the human relations training conducted by the Human Relations Institute at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, on trainees' racial attitudes. The work was initiated under Exploratory Development Work Unit PF55.521.101.03.C6 (Marine Corps Human Relations Institute Evaluation) and completed under the support of the Navy Human Goals Program.

The author wishes to express special appreciation to Ervin Curtis and John Sheposh for their consultation on this report. Also appreciated are the efforts of Edmund Thomas, John Smith, Charles Linenberger, and the training staff of the Human Relations Institute, San Diego, California.

J. J. CLARKIN
Commanding Officer

SUMMARY

Problem

The Marine Corps Human Relations Institute (HRI) was established at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California on 1 July 1972. Among the functions of HRI were (1) the study of attitudes and prejudices affecting human relations and (2) the evaluation of the Marine Corps Human Relations Program. HRI was subsequently disestablished in July 1974, and human relations training has been integrated with leadership training being conducted at Quantico, Virginia. It is necessary to determine whether the HRI training program was successful; that is, whether decreases in both positive and negative intraracial and interracial biases occurred as a result of HRI training.

Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was to document the effects of the HRI training on two measures of racial bias, the Social Distance Scale (SDS) and the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). Other objectives were to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the SDS and the SAS and to test the methodology of the SAS to determine whether it can be generalized to populations other than academic.

Approach

The SDS and SAS were adapted to measure the racial attitudes of Marines and the effect of the HRI training on those attitudes. These tests were administered to a group of HRI trainees before and after 10 weeks of human relations training. Two other groups with similar biographical characteristics were also tested. The first group was tested to assess the reliability of the measures; the other was used as a control group.

Findings

Positive and negative intraracial biases on the SDS decreased (i.e., moved toward a scale position of less bias) more for both white and black HRI trainees than for the white control group (pages 14 and 18). Positive and negative interracial biases decreased more than the control group only for white trainees (pages 14 and 18). Concerning the relation between interracial biases on the SAS and SDS, white trainees who were biased on the SDS tended to be biased in the same way on the SAS (page 21). No relation between the SAS and SDS was found for black trainees.

Consistent with previous research, no significant effect of human relations training was found on situational attitudes measured by the SAS (page 18). In contrast, the HRI training decreased racial biases in intrapersonal attitudes of black and white Marines as measured by the SDS.

Conclusions

The HRI training program decreased interracial and intraracial bias for white trainees more than for the control group, as measured on the SDS. Since there was no control group for black trainees, similar conclusions can not be drawn as to whether this effect occurred for black Marines.

Results show that those who were either negatively or positively biased on the pretest SDS tended to show similar bias on the pretest SAS. While the SAS and SDS used in this study were related, the SAS did not detect any effect of human relations training.

Recommendations

1. Further research in the human relations area should be directed at resolving the question of whether decreases in negative and positive interracial and intraracial bias is a reasonable goal for HRI training (p. 25).

2. Future evaluation efforts of the Marine Corps Human Relations Program should investigate the behavioral effects of training on intrapersonal factors (e.g., social skills and activity levels) (pp. 14-18).

3. If situational attitudes are considered in future evaluations of this program, further development of the adapted SAS is recommended (pp. 13, 18-21).

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Background	2
Attitude Measurement	2
Racial Attitude Scales	3
Purpose	4
Hypotheses	5
METHOD	7
Subjects	7
Social Distance Scale	7
Situational Attitude Scale	9
Procedure	10
RESULTS	13
Test-Retest Reliability	13
Hypothesis 1	14
Hypothesis 2	18
Hypothesis 3	21
CONCLUSIONS	23
RECOMMENDATIONS	25
REFERENCES	27
APPENDIX A - SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALES	A-0
APPENDIX B - SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE: SAS-B AND SCORING KEY	B-0
DISTRIBUTION LIST	

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Biographical Data for HRI Trainees	8
2.	Experimental Conditions for the Situational Attitude Scale	11
3.	Test-Retest Reliabilities for the Recruiter School (RS) and Control Samples	13
4.	Social Distance Scale Scores of White HRI Trainees	15
5.	Means and Standard Deviations for SDS-B and SDS-N Scores	16
6.	ANOVA Summary Table for SDS Black-Neutral Criterion Scores	17
7.	Comparison of Black-Neutral Criterion Scores of HRI Trainees and Control Group	17
8.	Means and Standard Deviations for SDS-W and SDS-N Scores	19
9.	ANOVA Summary Table for SDS White-Neutral Criterion Scores	20
10.	Comparison of White-Neutral Criterion Scores of HRI Trainees and Control Group	20
11.	Means and Standard Deviations for Pretest SAS Scores of White HRI Trainees	21
12.	Means and Standard Deviations of SAS Scores	22

INTRODUCTION

Problem

This study was part of a larger effort to evaluate the Marine Corps Human Relations (HR) Program. The basic objective of this program, as stated in Marine Corps Order (MCO) 5350.4A of 17 August 1973, was "to ensure more constructive relationships among Marines and between Marines and individuals outside the Marine Corps." A survey conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) of majority and minority groups in the Marine Corps suggested that the program should initially be directed toward racial problems. Therefore, educational materials and instructional techniques were developed by AIR to "ameliorate racially charged attitudes" (MCO 5350.4A).

The Marine Corps Human Relations Institute (HRI), which was established on 1 July 1972, at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, was listed in MCO 5350.4A as one element of the Marine Corps HR Program. Two of the functions of the HRI as stated in MCO 5350.4A, enclosure (1), are:

1. To assist in the study of prevailing conditions, attitudes, prejudices, and behavior affecting human relations as necessary to develop effective concepts, methods, materials, organizational structures and policy for effective human relations training and education within the Marine Corps.

2. To assist in the monitoring and evaluation of the Marine Corps human relations training and education program.

The HRI course was designed to decrease racial bias of any kind and to impart skills needed to enhance training of the course to other Marines in the field. The course used a value-oriented discussion manual designed primarily to improve attitudes and relationships not only among the trainees but also between the trainees and the communities in which they lived. All aspects of human relations were covered rather than just race relations, and similarities among people were emphasized rather than differences. The primary techniques employed at the HRI were (1) participating in a discussion group of approximately 15 trainees and one instructor, (2) leading the group discussion, (3) listening to lectures, and (4) participating in community and service affairs. Group discussions were based primarily on a manual developed by Mr. Robert L. Humphrey of AIR, which included a thorough development of an ethical rationale for improving human and race relations in terms of similarities, differences, and equality of people. Typically discussed topics included stereotyping, geographical and social influences on behavior, and changing one's own behavior.

Marine Corps Order 5350.4A required that Marines selected for HRI training must:

1. Be in the grades sergeant through lieutenant colonel. Volunteers were desired.

2. Have less than 1 year on station.

3. Have demonstrated leadership ability.

4. Have the ability to communicate effectively with individuals and groups.

5. Be of sound moral character.

6. Have an awareness of current social issues.

7. Have more than 1 year to EAS after graduation from HRI.

A congressional decision in 1973 to disestablish all service race relations schools resulted in the closing of HRI in July 1974. Recently, human relations training was integrated with leadership training conducted at the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia. No major changes were made in educational techniques or aids.

The problem addressed in the present research is to determine whether the HRI training program was successful; that is, whether decreases in both positive and negative intraracial and interracial biases occurred as a result of HRI training.

Background

Attitude Measurement

The literature on attitude measurement is replete with discussions of the problems involved in obtaining valid or useful attitude information. Frequently, inconsistency has been found between two instruments designed to assess identical attitudes (e.g., Triandis and Davis, 1965). Further, attitude scales have often failed to predict behaviors (e.g., Wicker and Bushweiler, 1970; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1972). Due to such measurement deficiencies, conclusions regarding the effectiveness of race relations training must often be tempered. Further refinements are needed in attitude scales, particularly racial attitude scales, to accurately evaluate training effects on attitudes.

Cook and Sellitz (1964) recommended a multiple indicator approach to attitude measurement as one solution to the often noted attitude-behavior discrepancy. This approach assumes that attitudes are an underlying disposition that enters, along with individual and situational characteristics, into the determination of behavior toward an object or class of objects (e.g., persons of a different race). A number of different measurement approaches should more completely cover the range of factors common to an underlying disposition.

Several discussions of the factors that influence attitude-behavior relationships have appeared in the literature (e.g., Cook and Selltiz, 1964; Fishbein, 1967; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1972). In Wicker's (1969) review of these factors, they were divided into intrapersonal and situational factors. The domain of intrapersonal factors included: other attitudes, competing motives, abilities (e.g., verbal, intellectual, and social skills), and activity levels. Situational factors included: normative prescriptions of proper behavior, alternative behaviors available, and specificity of attitude objects. Wicker concluded that behavior can be predicted more accurately when both intrapersonal and situational factors are considered. Further, the interaction of these factors has accounted for as much as 80% of the variance in behavioral intentions (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1972).

Racial Attitude Scales

As with attitude measurement in general, racial attitude scales suffer from several deficiencies. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) attempted to improve this condition with the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), a measure of the attitudes of whites toward blacks in specific situations. The SAS was developed to correct the following three deficiencies of most racial attitude scales: (1) lack of emphasis on the contemporary social scene, (2) lack of validity information, and (3) difficulty in obtaining valid attitudes when there is social reinforcement for being tolerant or positive toward blacks (i.e., demand characteristics).

Each of the two SAS forms (A and B) developed by Sedlacek and Brooks consisted of 10 items describing social or personal situations. The instructions were to respond to each of the 10 situations on 10 bipolar, semantic differential scales. The forms were identical except that the work "black" was included in the situations in Form B, but not in Form A. In a typical administration, half of the sample received Form A and half, Form B. Thus, half of the group was unaware that racial attitudes were being measured. Using this method, Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a, 1970b) and Brooks and Sedlacek (1970) demonstrated that insertion of the word "black" into the situations caused different responses (generally more negative) than if race was not mentioned. Hence, the SAS is a <u>method</u> of measuring racial attitudes as well as a <u>measure</u> of attitudes or feelings toward specific situations.

A more general measure of racial attitudes is the Social Distance Scale (SDS), originally devised by Bogardus in 1928. The use of the SDS as a measure of racial attitudes is well documented (Bogardus, 1967). Briefly, the SDS measures a person's willingness to engage in specific social interactions with a member of another race.

The SDS was orginally interpreted as evidence of racial prejudice because a white "prejudiced" person would indicate a desire for less intimate contact with a hypothetical person if that person were black.

However, the data presented by DeFleur and Westie (1958) suggest that some white subjects indicated a desire for more intimate contact if that hypothetical person were black. A pilot study conducted by the present author in 1973 revealed that this kind of bias was also expressed by a sample of the population investigated in this study. To distinguish between the two types of bias, the latter was termed "positive bias" and the former, "negative bias."

Hence, the SDS identifies biases in each subject by contrasting a subscale that has a target group referent with one that has no referent. The SAS identifies group biases by comparing subgroup differences on two forms, only one of which has a target group (e.g., black) referent.

In addition to using different methods, the two scales (SDS and SAS) measure somewhat different aspects of racial attitudes. The SDS appears to measure generalizable racial attitudes. The SAS, by contrast, is more likely restricted to measure attitudes associated with specific situations. Further, it can be argued that while the SAS assesses the situational factors mentioned by Wicker (1969), the SDS assesses more intrapersonal factors than generally acknowledged.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b) investigated social distance as it related to their SAS. They considered the possibility that responses to the situations were influenced by the differences in social distance values of the situations. Their post hoc analysis of social distance values was performed by 11 psychology and education graduate students, who ranked the 10 situations according to the degree of intimacy of contact with the person in the situation. Based on these rankings, the authors concluded that social distance was not an important source of variation. However, a more extensive analysis is required to determine how social distance (as measured by responses to a Social Distance Scale) relates to situational attitudes (as measured by responses to a Situational Attitude Scale).

A related question concerns the method of the SAS (half of the group is unaware of the scale's purpose). It remains to be determined whether similar results (i.e., more negative responses to the "black" form, SDS-B, versus the "neutral" form, SDS-N) are produced using the method of Sedlacek and Brooks with a different population and different stimulus situations.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to document the effects (if any) of the HRI training on two measures of racial bias, the SDS and SAS. At present, only one report exists where the SAS has been used to evaluate training (Brooks and Sedlacek, 1972). In that study, the SAS was used in a human relations program designed to teach white college students how to deal effectively with the needs of black residence hall students. After 4 months of training, the generally negative

attitudes toward blacks had not changed significantly. While the reasons were not clear, two explanations were presented: either the training was ineffective or the attitudes measured by the SAS were not affected by the program. It is possible, in other words, that some training effects did occur although attitudes toward the specific SAS situations did not change. Another more general measure of racial attitudes (e.g., the SDS) might have shown positive changes resulting from training.

A second purpose was to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the SDS and SAS. This was investigated in terms of positive and negative biases. If the trainees identified as biased on the SDS were also biased in the same direction on the SAS, this would constitute evidence that the two measures assess related dimensions. Since a larger score on the SAS indicates a greater negative affect, one would expect a larger mean score on the SAS-B (i.e., the SAS form referring to "blacks") than the SAS-N (i.e., the SAS form having no racial referent) for trainees having the negative bias that occurs on the SDS. Conversely, a lower SAS-B than SAS-N mean score would be consistent with a positive SDS bias. Furthermore, these biases ought to diminish with training.

A final purpose of this study was to test the methodology of the SAS, which would be a valuable tool if it were generalizable. This amounts to an investigation of whether situations and bipolar descriptors relevant to the Marine population could be substituted and still identify racial biases. If this were demonstrated, it would provide evidence that situation-specific attitudes can be used to discriminate between individuals of different populations merely by adapting the SAS to the population of interest.

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses were used in this study. The first was directed toward the primary objective and the other two, toward a better understanding of the relationship between the SDS and SAS.

Hypothesis 1. HRI trainees will be less biased[1] at the end of training than they were at the beginning of training.

Hypothesis 2. Trainees having a positive or negative bias on the SDS will show a similar type of bias on the SAS.

Hypothesis 3. Trainees having a positive or negative bias on the SDS will show differential changes on the SAS as a result of training.

---

[1]Since the purpose of HRI training was to reduce racial bias of any kind, the term "bias," as it is used here, refers to positive, negative, interracial, and intraracial biases.

METHOD

Subjects

A group of HRI trainees was tested on two measures of racial attitudes, the SDS and the 3AS. Two other groups having similar biographical characteristics were also tested. One group was tested to assess the reliability of the measures, while the other was used as a control group.

The HRI trainees were 52 of the original 66 regular Marines who began training on 8 January 1974. Of these 52, 20 categorized themselves as black and 32, white. Excluded from the study were: (1) six trainees who categorized themselves as neither black nor white and (2) eight trainees who failed to complete the training. Table 1, which presents biographical data for 48 of these trainees, reveals that the typical HRI trainee was an E-6, between 25 and 29 years of age, a high school graduate, and the recipient of 20 hours of human relations training.

The reliability group comprised 50 Marines stationed at a nearby Marine recruiter's school. The control group consisted of 25 white Marines in the process of completing a 2-year junior college program.

Social Distance Scale

The Social Distance Scale (SDS), originally devised by Bogardus (1928), has been modified several times (e.g., Linn, 1965). The SDS measure employed in this study (see Appendix A) assesses the individual's reactions to (1) items that refer to a target group (i.e., blacks, whites, or persons of a different ethnic background) and (2) the same items that do not refer to a target group (i.e, neutral). Form A in Appendix A comprises the neutral items and Form B, the target group items.

The instructions were to indicate, on a 9-point scale, how close the subject would have to be to a person to engage in the activity described in the item. A scale value of 1 indicated that the subject would have to be "very close"; 5, "moderately close"; 9, "not close."

Form A, the neutral form, included 24 items. These same items appeared three times in Form B, the target group form, but each time with a different target group descriptor (i.e., "black," "white," or "person of a different ethnic background"). Thus, each of the 24 items appeared 4 times in the SDS. The sum of the 24 neutral items are referred to as SDS-N (the Neutral SDS subscale). The sums of the target group items are referred to as SDS-B, SDS-W, and SDS-O (the Black, White, and Other subscales, respectively). No use was made of the SDS-O in this study.

Table 1

Biographical Data for HRI Trainees

Race of Trainee	Instructor	Paygrade					Age						Education						Human Relations Background				
		E-1 to E-5	E-6	E-7 to E-9	W-1 to W-4	O1 to O3	Under 22	22-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	Some High School	GED	H.S. Grad	1-2 years College	BA/BS	Graduate Study	None	20 hours	Some Discussion Training	Discussion Training	Discussion Leader
Black (N=12)	Black	6	5	1	-	-	1	3	4	3	1	-	1	5	4	2	-	-	1	4	2	1	4
Black (N=7)	White	3	2	2	-	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	-	-	5	1	-	1	1	4	-	1	1
White (N=17)	Black	3	6	3	1	4	-	4	4	5	3	1	-	1	6	6	4	-	2	9	-	2	4
White (N=12)	White	2	3	3	-	4	-	3	5	1	2	1	-	1	6	2	2	1	3	9	-	-	-
TOTAL		14	16	9	1	8	1	11	15	12	7	2	1	7	21	11	6	2	7	26	2	4	9

Note. Although there were attitudinal data for 50 trainees, biographical data were available for only 48.

A respondent who tended to answer at the "not close" end of the social distance scale would have a high subscale score. A respondent who tended to answer at the "very close" end of the scale would have a low score. This requirement or lack of requirement for closeness to engage in activities with others is the concept which the SDS attempts to measure.

A high or low score on one of the SDS subscales does not in itself denote prejudice. Rather, prejudice can be inferred when a subject's score on one of the target SDS subscales compares unfavorably with his SDS-N score. A pilot study conducted during the latter part of 1973 revealed that two kinds of biases were obtained when this comparison was made: (1) positive versus negative biases and (2) interracial versus intraracial biases.

Concerning the first kind of bias, some subjects in the pilot study reacted to the SDS with the traditional negative bias; that is, they indicated a requirement for a greater degree of intimacy (i.e., for less social distance) before engaging in a given act with a member of the target group. When this occurred, the subject's SDS target score was less than his SDS-N score. Others reacted with a positive bias; that is, they indicated that they required a lesser degree of intimacy before engaging in a given act with a target-group member. In this case, the subject's target SDS score was greater than his SDS-N score.

The interracial versus intraracial bias discovered in the pilot study indicated that subjects expressed positive and negative biases not only toward persons of another race--interracial bias--but also toward persons of the same race--intraracial bias.

Situational Attitude Scale

Rather than the original SAS, devised by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a), a variation of that scale was employed in the present study. It included 10 items that described situations relevant to interracial attitudes in the Marine population. Topic areas (corresponding to items 1 through 10) included aggression, music, social in-groups, intelligence, insubordination, social awareness, work in-groups, unfair treatment, adherence to rules, and rape. The subjects were instructed to indicate the direction and extent of their feelings toward a given situation on a 5-point (A to E), semantic differential scale with bipolar descriptors (e.g., angry, not angry). Five such scales were presented following each situation description. Situations and bipolar descriptors were chosen with the assistance of the Marine instructors at HRI.

Three forms of the SAS were used in this study, all with identical formats and bipolar descriptors. The first made no reference to any target group (the SAS-N form); the second described the person or persons in the situations as "White" (the SAS-W form); and the third described the people in the situations as "Black" (the SAS-B form). (See Appendix B for the items and situations used in the SAS-B.)

Rather than using item scores, as did Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a), a scoring scheme (described in Appendix B) was devised to combine (sum) the items and derive a total score for the entire instrument. A high score on the SAS indicated a high negative affect associated with the range of situations described therein, and a low score, a low negative affect. This notion of a greater or lesser degree of affect associated with a situation is the concept of situational attitude.

A high or low score on one of the SAS forms does not in itself reflect prejudice, however. The method of testing associated with the SAS calls for administering the various forms of the scale to randomly divided subgroups of the total group. The average scores of the subgroups are then compared to determine if the total group is prejudiced. For example, if the subgroup completing the SAS-B scores higher on the average than the subgroup completing the SAS-N, it can be inferred that the group associates more negative affect with blacks than with people-in-general (i.e., the group is prejudiced toward blacks).

Procedure

The 52 HRI trainees (20 black and 32 white) were tested on the SDS before and after 10 weeks of HRI training. However, since two white trainees did not entirely complete both SDS forms during the two test administrations, they were excluded from the SDS analyses. For the SAS testing, the 52 trainees were assigned to one of the SAS experimental conditions indicated in Table 2. Assignment to SAS conditions was on a random basis, except that trainees were distributed proportionately by paygrade across all conditions. (Due to a limited number of trainees, fewer were assigned to conditions 3 and 4 than to conditions 1 and 2, and no post-only controls were maintained for black trainees.) Since one white and four black trainees did not entirely complete their SAS forms, they were excluded from the SAS analyses and from Table 2.

The pilot study revealed that the race of the instructor interacted with the effect of training. Hence, the distribution of black and white trainees in the classes of black and white instructors was an important consideration in this study. HRI personnel assigned trainees to the classes of black and white instructors based on the rank and race of the trainee. (See Table 1 for the number of black and white trainees assigned to the classes conducted by black and white instructors.) Therefore, since the effect of instructor race was procedurally controlled, it was not likely to be a confounding variable.

The 50 Marines in the reliability group (46 white and 4 black) were administered the SDS and SAS at a 2-week interval. Test-retest conditions closely approximated those at the HRI. Since the reliability group included two few blacks to determine the test reliability for blacks, the scores of the four black Marines were eliminated from the analyses. Moreover, eight white Marines either had been dropped or were otherwise unable to attend the posttest session. Finally, four white Marines failed to entirely complete the posttest. Thus, scores of only 34 Marines from the

recruiter school were included in the subsequent analysis. All 34 completed the SDS. Sixteen of them completed the SAS-B and 18, the SAS-N (assigned randomly).

The 25 Marines (all white) in the control group were administered the SDS during the course of their studies and, again, 10 weeks later. The SAS was not administered to this group. Since three members of this group were not available to complete the posttest, their scores were eliminated from the analysis.

Table 2

Experimental Conditions for the Situational Attitude Scale

Condition	SAS Form	Tests Completed		Number of Trainees[a]	
		Pre and Post	Post Only	Black	White
1	SAS-B	X			10
2	SAS-N	X			10
3	SAS-B		X		5
4	SAS-N		X		6
5	SAS-W	X		8	
6	SAS-N	X		8	

[a]The number of trainees reported here reflects the number that actually completed the SAS form indicated.

RESULTS

Test-Retest Reliability

The test-retest correlations or reliabilities computed for the recruiter school and control group on the SDS and SAS subscales are shown in Table 3. The correlations for the two groups are presented separately since different time intervals (2 weeks versus 10 weeks) were involved. All SDS subscales showed a high degree of reliability. However, there is a notable discrepancy between the two groups in the correlations obtained for the absolute values of the SDS-B minus SDS-N subscale scores ($\underline{r}$ = .31 versus $\underline{r}$ = .74). Concerning the SAS subscale obtained for the recruiter school group, the SAS-B demonstrated substantial reliability ($\underline{r}$ = .82). However, a less than acceptable reliability coefficient ($\underline{r}$ = .48) was obtained for the SAS-N.

Table 3

Test-Retest Reliabilities for the Recruiter School (RS) and Control Samples

	RS Sample[a]		Control Sample	
Subscale	N	Test-Retest Correlation	N	Test-Retest Correlation
SDS-N	34	.89	22	.80
SDS-B	34	.94	22	.92
SDS-W	34	.89	22	.91
|(SDS-B) - (SDS-N)|	34	.31	22	.74
|(SDS-W) - (SDS-N)|	34	.84	22	.63
SAS-N	18	.48		--[b]
SAS-B	16	.82		--[b]

[a]Reliabilities for black RS trainees were not computed due to the small sample size.

[b]Data not collected for this group.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis employed in this study is that trainees will be less biased at the end of training than they were at the beginning. This hypothesis was tested by computing the black-neutral criterion scores for Marines in the HRI group and the control group. Table 4 shows how this criterion score was derived for the 30 white HRI trainees. The SDS-B score minus the SDS-N score equals the difference score, D. This difference score was derived for both the pretest, D_1, and the posttest, D_2. A negative D score indicates a negative bias, and a positive D score, a positive bias. The D_1 score minus the D_2 score equals the black-neutral criterion score.

Since the purpose of the HRI training was to decrease racial bias of any kind, positive or negative, the direction of the bias was not considered in testing the first hypothesis. Instead, the absolute values of the D scores were employed to obtain the black-neutral criterion scores. A positive criterion score represents an increase in bias at the end of training, and a negative criterion score, a decrease in bias.

Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations derived for the white HRI trainees, black HRI trainees, and the control group. To test the general null hypothesis that there are no differences in change of bias between the three groups, their black-neutral criterion scores were entered as the dependent variable in a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with each group as a level of the analysis. Table 6, which summarizes the results of this ANOVA, shows that a marginally significant difference was obtained. Specific comparisons were also made as suggested by Winer (1971):

> The specific comparisons which are built into the design or suggested by the theoretical basis for the experiment can and should be made individually, regardless of the outcome of the corresponding overall F test. (p. 384)

The specific comparisons of interest are whether the attitudes of black and white trainees decrease in bias more than those of the control group.[2] Table 7, which presents the statistics relevant to these comparisons, shows that the attitudes of the black HRI trainees and the white HRI trainees decreased in bias toward blacks significantly more than those of the control group. Stated differently, both the intraracial bias of black trainees and the interracial bias of white trainees decreased significantly more than the interracial bias of the white control group.

---

[2]Since all 3 hypotheses predict a definite direction and the pilot study indicated no deviations from this direction, one-tailed tests of significance were employed.

Table 4

Social Distance Scale Scores
of White HRI Trainees

Trainee	Pretest Scores			Posttest Score			Black-Neutral Criterion Score
	SDS-B	SDS-N	$B_1-N_1=D_1$	SDS-B	SDS-N	$B_2-N_2=D_2$	$(\lvert D_2 \rvert - \lvert D_1 \rvert)$
1	114	114	0	121	125	-4	4
2	129	145	-16	155	153	2	-14
3	199	178	21	194	182	12	-9
4	154	139	15	162	160	2	-13
5	154	157	3	143	149	-6	3
6	96	134	-38	144	149	-5	33
7	147	137	10	129	128	1	-9
8	139	152	-13	136	134	2	-11
9	144	134	10	146	146	0	-10
10	170	173	-3	161	158	3	0
11	151	152	-1	164	164	0	-1
12	137	143	-6	126	132	-6	0
13	146	150	-4	163	160	3	-1
14	178	186	-8	184	187	-3	-5
15	157	150	7	171	163	8	1
16	113	105	8	212	212	0	-8
17	131	140	-9	145	148	-3	-6
18	175	171	4	160	153	7	3
19	132	133	-1	143	146	-3	2
20	101	112	-11	116	116	0	-11
21	179	170	9	143	124	19	10
22	154	147	7	177	155	22	15
23	204	185	19	200	196	4	-15
24	134	139	-5	160	155	5	0
25	157	146	11	158	147	11	0
26	149	151	-2	121	123	-2	0
27	170	176	-6	155	158	-3	-3
28	152	150	2	116	125	-9	7
29	195	152	43	189	168	21	-22
30	201	186	15	171	169	2	-13

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for SDS-B and SDS-N Scores

Group	Pretest Score				Posttest Score				D Score[a]				Black-Neut. Crit. Score[a]	
	SDS-B		SDS-N		SDS-B		SDS-N		D_1		D_2			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Black HRI Trainees (N = 20)	162.5	30.4	148.7	32.5	165.0	22.5	152.2	26.3	20.00	16.69	13.75	19.06	-6.25	16.46
White HRI Trainees (N = 30)	156.1	28.0	150.2	21.1	155.5	24.9	152.8	22.3	10.23	9.85	5.60	5.86	-4.63	9.72
Control Group (N = 22)	147.2	37.3	143.9	25.7	150.3	33.7	149.7	27.1	14.95	15.42	16.68	17.00	1.77	11.85

[a]These statistics were computed on the absolute value of the D scores.

Table 6

ANOVA Summary Table for SDS
Black-Neutral Criterion Scores

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Group	2	791.3	395.6	2.52*
Within Groups	69	10,838.6	157.1	
Total	71	11,629.9		

*p = .09

Table 7

Comparison of Black-Neutral Criterion
Scores of HRI Trainees and Control Group

Comparison[a]	Criterion Score Values	Difference	Standard Error	T Value	Degrees of Freedom
1. B - W_c	(-6.25)-(1.77)	-8.02	4.46	-1.80*	34.2
2. W - W_c	(-4.63)-(1.77)	-6.41	3.09	-2.08*	39.8

[a] B = Black HRI trainees
W = White HRI trainees
W_c = White control group

* $p<.05$

The white-neutral criterion scores were also computed for the three groups. (Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations derived from the SDS-W and SDS-N scores.) These criterion scores were entered into a one-way ANOVA to test the general null hypothesis that there are no differences in change of bias toward whites between the three groups. Table 9, which summarizes the results of this ANOVA, shows that a marginally significant difference was obtained. Table 10 shows that the bias held by the black trainees toward whites decreased significantly more than that of the control group. That is, the intraracial bias of white trainees, but not the interracial bias of black trainees, decreased significantly more than intraracial bias of the white control group.

The SAS was also investigated as it pertained to hypothesis 1. No statistically significant change in bias was found for either the black or the white trainees. Hence, no support was found for hypothesis 1 as it applied to the SAS.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that trainees having a positive or negative bias on the SDS will show a similar type of bias on the SAS. In other words, trainees in the SAS-N group having a positive bias on the SDS will have higher SAS scores than those in the SAS-B group having a positive SDS bias. Conversely, negative bias trainees in the SAS-N group will have lower scores than negative bias trainees in the SAS-B group. (The same hypothesis was made for black trainees substituting "SAS-W" where "SAS-B" appears.) White trainees were designated as having either a positive or a negative bias based on the difference between their SDS-B and SDS-N scores (i.e., the D_1 scores of Table 4). Those having positive D_1 scores on the SDS comprised the positive bias group; those having either a zero (one trainee) or a negative D_1 score, the negative bias group.

Table 11 presents the data relevant to this hypothesis for the 20 white HRI trainees in SAS experimental conditions 1 and 2 (see Table 2). The four groups shown are independent of each other; that is, each trainee appears in only one of the four groups. As described previously, the HRI trainees were assigned to the SAS experimental conditions on a random basis, while controlling for rank. Table 11 shows that, within the positive SDS bias group, the mean score of the SAS-B subgroup was lower than that of the SAS-N subgroup. The statistical test used was a one-tailed t test for independent means. The t statistic shown in Table 11 was 1.631 ($p = .069$, $df = 9$)--not significant at the .05 level. The same statistical test was applied to the data for the negative SDS bias group. As expected, the mean SAS-B score was greater than the mean SAS-N score for these trainees. The t statistic was 2.053 ($p = .035$, $df = 9$)--statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for SDS-W and SDS-N Scores

Group	Pretest Score				Posttest Score				D Score[a]				White-Neut. Crit. Score[a]	
	SDS-W		SDS-N		SDS-W		SDS-N		D_1		D_2			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Black HRI Trainees (N = 20)	155.5	35.4	148.7	32.5	156.4	26.2	152.5	26.3	16.60	13.86	11.80	17.67	-4.80	11.45
White HRI Trainees (N = 30)	157.4	31.2	150.2	21.1	157.3	26.8	152.8	22.3	14.47	12.18	7.47	7.92	-7.00	10.48
White Controls (N = 22)	152.3	33.9	143.9	25.7	155.7	31.8	149.7	27.1	16.77	17.98	17.55	21.48	0.77	17.22

[a]These statistics were computed on the absolute value of the D scores.

Table 9

ANOVA Summary Table for SDS
White-Neutral Criterion Scores

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	783.9	392.0	2.27*
Within Groups	69	11,905.1	172.5	
Total	71	12,684.0		

*p = .11

Table 10

Comparison of White-Neutral Criterion
Scores of HRI Trainees and Control Group

Comparison[a]	Criterion Score Values	Difference	Standard Error	T Value	Degrees of Freedom
1. B - W_c	(-4.80)-(0.77)	-5.57	4.48	-1.24	36.8
2. W - W_c	(-7.00)-(0.77)	-7.77	4.14	-1.88*	32.2

[a] B = Black HRI trainees
W = White HRI trainees
W_c = White control

*p<.05

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for
Pretest SAS Scores of White HRI Trainees

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Positive SDS Bias				
SAS-B	5	131.8	18.36	
SAS-N	5	145.8	5.59	1.631*
Negative SDS Bias				
SAS-B	5	147.4	8.71	
SAS-N	5	133.4	13.22	2.053**

*p = 0.069
**p = 0.035

Thus, while only one of the differences was significant, both were in the direction predicted by hypothesis 2. According to elementary probability theory (Hays and Winkler, 1970), the joint probability that two independent events both occur is the product of the probabilities of the two events (i.e., 0.069 x 0.035 = 0.0024). Thus, the chances are less than 1 in 100 (i.e., $p < .01$) that both means would differ in those directions and magnitudes if a difference did not really exist. The probability that at least one of the differences occurred by chance is, according to Hays (1963), 1 - (1 - 0.069)(1 - 0.035) = 0.102--not statistically significant. Hence, modest support for the second hypothesis was obtained with the data on white trainees. No support was obtained with the data on black trainees.

Hypothesis 3

The final hypothesis was that the SAS would indicate decreases in positive and negative SDS bias as a result of training. Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of pretest and posttest SAS subscales for the black and white HRI trainees in SAS experimental conditions 1, 2, 5 and 6. Counter to the hypothesis, the biases increased although not significantly. Since the SAS scores did not indicate that decreases in bias had occurred as the result of HRI training, the sensitizing effect of the pretest is a moot question. For this reason the post-only controls, i.e., those assigned to SAS experimental conditions 3 and 4 of Table 2, were not analyzed.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of SAS Scores

SAS Condition[a]	SAS Subscale	HRI Trainees	Pretest Score M	Pretest Score SD	Posttest Score M	Posttest Score SD
1	SAS-B	White (N = 10)	139.8	15.89	138.7	17.90
2	SAS-N	White (N = 10)	139.6	11.59	135.0	21.96
5	SAS-W	Black (N = 8)	138.1	8.29	136.6	15.08
6	SAS-N	Black (N = 8)	135.5	5.37	128.4	18.62

[a]Means and standard deviations not computed for Conditions 3 and 4.

CONCLUSIONS

In this investigation, both black and white Marines were used, interracial and intraracial attitudes were assessed, positive and negative biases were investigated, and two measures of racial attitudes were employed. Because of moderate scale reliabilities and small sample sizes, fairly large true differences had to exist in order to attain the required level of signficance ($p < .05$) on the observed differences. Although sizeable differences were found, they were not always statistically significant. This may have been caused by scale unreliability. A more reliable scale might have detected statistically significant differences.

Consistent with the findings of Brooks and Sedlacek (1970), the SAS did not detect any effect of human relations training (hypothesis 3). However, the evidence supporting hypothesis 2 was inconsistent with data presented by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b). They reported no systematic relation existed between situational attitudes, as measured by their SAS, and social distance, as measured by ratings of the SAS situations.

The present effort employed pencil-and-paper measures of both situational attitudes and social distance to assess racial bias. Since these measures were completed by the Marines themselves, the confounding factor of "experts" judging the social distance values of situations was not present. The results of the investigation with white trainees supported hypothesis 2; that is, those who were either negatively or positively biased toward blacks on the pretest SDS also tended to react consistently biased, i.e., with greater or lesser affect, respectively, on the pretest SAS.

Even though the SAS did reveal prejudice among the white trainees, it was not always the kind of prejudice described by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a, 1970b). They described a prejudice characterized by whites reacting with more negative affect toward blacks than toward neutral persons. The present study did not find that kind of prejudice, exclusively, on the SAS. Rather, some reacted with a positive bias and others, with a negative bias. The SAS showed no biases of any kind for black trainees in the present study.

The SAS used by Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a, 1970b) contained different situations and a different scoring scheme than the SAS employed in this study. Also, they employed a sample of white college students, while both black and white Marines were used in the present investigation. Since prejudice on the SAS was detected in white Marines using the present scoring method and situations, this demonstrates that (1) the SAS is not method-bound and (2) it can be successfully adapted to different populations.

The conclusion the data support most strongly is that the HRI training program, as designed, decreased interracial and intraracial bias on the SDS for white Marines. While the black HRI trainees did decrease in intraracial bias more than the white control group, a significant decrease in interracial bias was not observed relative to that group. However, without an appropriate control group for the black trainees, no conclusions can be drawn as to whether or not black interracial and/or intraracial biases decreased due to HRI training.

A question that arises at this point is whether decreases in negative and positive biases toward one's own race or a different race is a reasonable goal for the HRI training. Some researchers feel that since positive biases would not be expected to lead to interracial problems, these biases are at least not undesirable and are more correctly categorized as personal preferences. Therefore, racial affect that is not overtly negative should not be of major concern in human relations training. Others argue that positive intraracial and interracial biases are still biases based on perceptions of racial differences. Highly positive intraracial biases might be expected to encourage negative interracial biases, while highly positive interracial biases might be perceived by others as being insincere or socially awkward. It is recommended that further research conducted in this area be directed toward resolving this issue.

Since data on behavioral changes were not available, the effects of training on behavior could not be determined. However, the findings indicate that attitudinal changes do occur within Wicker's (1969) domain of intrapersonal factors (i.e., social distance). Whether one ascribes to the theory that behavior changes lead to attitude changes (e.g., Cook, 1969) or that attitudes predict behavior (e.g., Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970), it appears that HRI training is likely to effect behavioral/attitudinal changes in the intrapersonal domain. Hence, it is recommended that future evaluation efforts of the Marine Corps Human Relations Program investigate the behavioral effects of training on intrapersonal factors (e.g., social skills and activity levels).

The present study found no evidence that the HRI training effects attitudinal changes in the situational factors domain. While this finding is consistent with previous research, the SAS used in this study was not the same scale described in the literature but, rather, an adaptation thereof. Both positive and negative biases were found on the SAS with the present population and adapted scale, but only with white Marines. If situational attitudes are considered in future evaluations of the Marine Corps Human Relations Program, further development of the adapted SAS is recommended.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. Prediction of behavior from attitudinal and normative variables. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1970, 6, 466-487.

Bogardus, E. S. Immigration and race attitudes. Boston: Heath, 1928.

Bogardus, E. S. A forty-year social distance study. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1967.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Sedlacek, W. E. An experimental study of differential reactions of whites toward negroes and blacks. Proceedings, American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 359-360.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Sedlacek, W. E. A pilot study of racial attitudes and "behavioral changes" of unversity residence hall staff. Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, March 27, 1972.

Cook, S. W., & Selltiz, C. A. Multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 1, 36-55.

Cook, S. W. Motives in a conceptual analysis of attitude-related behavior. In W. J. Arnold, & D. Levine (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

DeFleur, M. L., & Westie, F. R. Verbal attitudes and overt acts: An experiment on the salience of attitudes. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 667-673.

Fishbein, M. Attitude and the prediction of behavior. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. Attitudes and opinions. Annual Review of Psychology, 1972, 23, 487-544.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. San Francisco: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Hays, W. L., & Winkler, R. L. Statistics: Probability, inference, and decision. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970, Vol. 1.

Linn, T. S. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior: A study in racial discrimination. Social Forces, 1965, 43, 353-364.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. The development of a measure of racial attitudes. Proceedings, American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 161-162. (a)

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. Psychological Reports. 1970, 27, 971-980. (b)

Triandis, H. C., & Davis, E. E. Race and belief as determinants of behavioral intentions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 715-725.

Wicker, A. W. Attitudes vs. actions. The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 41-78.

Wicker, A. W., & Bushweiler, G. Perceived fairness and pleasantness of social exchange situations: Two factorial studies of inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 63-75.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALES:

FORM A - Neutral Form

FORM B - Target Group Form

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

FORM A

For each of the phrases below indicate how close a person would have to be for you to engage in the act with him. Please respond at the right of each question according to the following scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close			*Moderately Close*					*Not Close*

1. To eat lunch at the same table with him. ____
2. To have your children be close friends with his children. ____
3. To marry him/her. ____
4. To ask him to join a private club to which you belong. ____
5. To use the same dentist he uses. ____
6. To rent a room to him. ____
7. To accept him as an intimate friend. ____
8. To openly converse and disclose your feelings to him. ____
9. To accept him as a roommate. ____
10. To share an apartment with him. ____
11. To bowl on the same team with him. ____
12. To have your daughter marry his son. ____
13. To do business with him. ____
14. To have him teach your children. ____
15. To have your daughter date his son. ____
16. To accept him as your work supervisor. ____
17. To invite him to a dinner party at your house. ____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close				Moderately Close				Not Close

18. To invite him to your home for Thanksgiving dinner. ____

19. To invite him over to watch television in your house. ____

20. To double with him on a date. ____

21. To ask him to join you for lunch. ____

22. To have your children go to school with his children. ____

23. To have your children play with his children. ____

24. To be seen in public with him. ____

SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

FORM B

For each of the phrases below indicate how close a person would have to be for you to engage in the act with him. Please respond at the right of each question according to the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close				*Moderately Close*				*Not Close*

---

1. To be seen in public with a person of a different ethnic background. ____
2. To have your children play with Black children. ____
3. To have your children go to school with White children. ____
4. To ask a person of a different ethnic background to join you for lunch. ____
5. To double with a Black on a date. ____
6. To invite a White over to watch television in your home. ____
7. To invite a person of a different ethnic background to your home for Thanksgiving dinner. ____
8. To invite a Black to a dinner party at your home. ____
9. To accept a White as your work supervisor. ____
10. To have your daughter date the son of a man whose ethnic background is different from yours. ____
11. To have a Black teach your children. ____
12. To do business with a White. ____
13. To have your daughter marry the son of a man whose ethnic background is different from yours. ____
14. To bowl on the same team with a Black. ____
15. To share an apartment with a White. ____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close			Moderately Close					Not Close

16. To accept a person of a different ethnic background as a roommate. ____

17. To openly converse and disclose your feelings to a Black. ____

18. To accept a White as an intimate friend. ____

19. To rent a room to a person of a different ethnic background. ____

20. To use the same dentist a Black uses. ____

21. To ask a White to join a private club to which you belong. ____

22. To marry a person of a different ethnic background. ____

23. To have your children be close friends with a Black's children. ____

24. To eat lunch at the same table with a White. ____

25. To be seen in public with a White. ____

26. To have your children play with the children of a person of a different ethnic background. ____

27. To have your children go to school with a Black's children. ____

28. To ask a White to join you for lunch. ____

29. To double with a person of a different ethnic background on a date. ____

30. To invite a Black over to watch television in your nome. ____

31. To invite a White to your home for Thanksgiving dinner. ____

32. To invite a person of a different ethnic background to a dinner party at your home. ____

33. To accept a Black as your work supervisor. ____

34. To have your daughter date a White's son. ____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close			Moderately Close					Not Close

35. To have a person of a different ethnic background teach your children. ____

36. To do business with a Black. ____

37. To have your daughter marry a White's son. ____

38. To bowl on the same team with a person of a different ethnic background. ____

39. To share an apartment with a Black. ____

40. To accept a White as a roommate. ____

41. To openly converse and disclose your feelings to a person of a different ethnic background. ____

42. To accept a Black as an intimate friend. ____

43. To rent a room to a White. ____

44. To use the same dentist that a person of a different ethnic background uses. ____

45. To ask a Black to join a private club to which you belong. ____

46. To marry a White. ____

47. To have your children be close friends with children of a different ethnic background. ____

48. To eat lunch at the same table with a Black. ____

49. To be seen in public with a Black. ____

50. To have your children play with a White's children. ____

51. To have your children go to school with children of a different ethnic background. ____

52. To ask a Black to join you for lunch. ____

53. To double with a White on a date. ____

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Close				Moderately Close				Not Close

54. To invite a person of a different ethnic background over to watch television in your home. ____

55. To invite a Black to your home for Thanksgiving dinner. ____

56. To invite a White to a dinner party at your home. ____

57. To accept as your work supervisor a person of a different ethnic background. ____

58. To have you daughter date the son of a Black. ____

59. To have a White teach your children. ____

60. To do business with a person of a different ethnic background. ____

61. To have your daughter marry a Black. ____

62. To bowl on the same team with a White. ____

63. To share an apartment with a person of a different ethnic background. ____

64. To accept a Black as a roommate. ____

65. To openly converse and disclose your feelings to a White. ____

66. To accept a person of a different ethnic background as an intimate friend. ____

67. To rent a room to a Black. ____

68. To use the same dentist as a White. ____

69. To ask a person of a different ethnic background to join a private club to which you belong. ____

70. To marry a Black. ____

71. To have your children be close friends with a White's children. ____

72. To eat lunch at the same table with a person of a different ethnic background. ____

APPENDIX B

SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE:

SAS-B AND SCORING KEY

SITUATIONAL ATTITUDE SCALE:

SAS-B and Scoring Key

The scoring key that appears on the right of each item (but which did not appear on the actual forms) indicates the value assigned to response A of that particular item. The remaining responses were assigned values either increasing from 1 to 5 (for items in which response A was keyed 1) or decreasing from 5 to 1 (for items in which response A was keyed 5). Based on experimentor judgment, the scale value of 5 was assigned to the end of the bipolar scale having the most negative affect.

Student _____

Instructor _____

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. This information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for research purposes.

Each item or situation is followed by 5 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy A B C D E sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice of the answer scale. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impression whenever possible.

							Scoring Key
1. You are being harassed by four Black men in the barracks.							
angry	A	B	C	D	E	not angry	5
hostile	A	B	C	D	E	indifferent	5
important	A	B	C	D	E	trivial	5
fearful	A	B	C	D	E	secure	5
comfortable	A	B	C	D	E	uncomfortable	1
2. Loud music is being played by a Black man down the hall in the barracks which is keeping you awake.							
understanding	A	B	C	D	E	indifferent	5
pleased	A	B	C	D	E	angered	1
trivial	A	B	C	D	E	important	1
threatened	A	B	C	D	E	neutral	5
objectionable	A	B	C	D	E	acceptable	5

							Scoring Key
3. A new Black man joins your unit. He immediately tries to join your social group.							
threatened	A	B	C	D	E	neutral	5
understanding	A	B	C	D	E	indifferent	1
suspicious	A	B	C	D	E	trusting	5
disappointed	A	B	C	D	E	elated	5
favorable	A	B	C	D	E	unfavorable	1
4. A Black man working under you makes an obvious and stupid mistake.							
humorous	A	B	C	D	E	serious	1
suspicious	A	B	C	D	E	trusting	5
indifferent	A	B	C	D	E	annoyed	1
sympathetic	A	B	C	D	E	not sympathetic	1
friendly	A	B	C	D	E	unfriendly	1
5. You observe an enlisted Black Marine fail to salute an officer.							
indifferent	A	B	C	D	E	furious	1
tolerant	A	B	C	D	E	intolerant	1
aggressive	A	B	C	D	E	passive	5
surprised	A	B	C	D	E	not surprised	1
objectionable	A	B	C	D	E	acceptable	5
6. You observe a loud [illegible]isterous group of Black Marines in the Club.							
smart	A	B	C	D	E	dumb	1
aggressive	A	B	C	D	E	passive	5
indifferent	A	B	C	D	E	suspicious	1
friendly	A	B	C	D	E	unfriendly	1
excited	A	B	C	D	E	unexcited	5

7. A group of five Black Marines is given office hours for being 10 minutes U.A.

surprised	A	B	C	D	E	unsurprised	1
understanding	A	B	C	D	E	not understandable	5
tolerable	A	B	C	D	E	intolerable	5
aloof	A	B	C	D	E	outraged	5
sympathetic	A	B	C	D	E	unsympathetic	1

8. A Black man in your unit requests mast with the C.O. concerning unfair treatment.

suspicious	A	B	C	D	E	trusting	5
approval	A	B	C	D	E	disapproval	1
tense	A	B	C	D	E	calm	5
right	A	B	C	D	E	wrong	1
superior	A	B	C	D	E	inferior	5

9. A Black officer is giving you a hard time for a minor infraction.

indifferent	A	B	C	D	E	displeased	5
suspicious	A	B	C	D	E	trusting	1
justified	A	B	C	D	E	unjustified	5
angered	A	B	C	D	E	not angered	1
objectionable	A	B	C	D	E	acceptable	1

10. You read in the paper that a Black Woman Marine was raped on base.

provoked	A	B	C	D	E	unprovoked	1
indifferent	A	B	C	D	E	disgust	5
uninvolved	A	B	C	D	E	involved	5
sympathetic	A	B	C	D	E	unsympathetic	1
trivial	A	B	C	D	E	important	5

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (M&RA), Washington, D.C.
Chief of Naval Operations (OP-01P) (5), (OP-099), (OP-987P10), (OP-992E)
Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-0d), (Pers-1), (Pers-10c), (Pers-2), (Pers-523), (Pers-63), (Pers-64) (10), (Pers-65) (10), (Pers-8)
Chief of Naval Research (Code 450) (4)
Chief of Naval Research (Code 452) (2)
Chief of Naval Material (NMAT 0344) (NMAT 035)
Chief of Naval Technical Training
Chief of Naval Technical Training (Code 016)
Chief of Naval Education & Training (CNET N-5), (CNET 003), (CNET 014) (CNET 01A)
Chief of Naval Education & Training Support
Chief of Naval Education & Training Support (01A)
Chief of Information (OI-2252)
Commandant of the Marine Corps (MP) (3), (MPE) (3)
Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/62)
Commander Navy Recruiting Command (00)
Commander Naval Training Center, Great Lakes
Commander Naval Training Center, Orlando
Commander Naval Training Center, San Diego
Commanding Officer, Naval Health Research Center
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management School (20)
Commanding Officer, Naval Education & Training Program Development Center (2)
Commanding Officer, Naval Development & Training Center (Code 0120)
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Center, London
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Center, Norfolk
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Center, Pearl Harbor
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Center, San Diego
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Center, Washington, D.C.
Commanding Officer, Naval Aerospace Medical Insitute (Library Code 12) (2)
Commanding Officer, Fleet Training Center, San Diego
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Alameda
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Charleston
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Guam
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Jacksonville
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Naples
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Rota
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Subic Bay
Officer in Charge, Human Resource Management Detachment, Yokosuka
Officer in Charge, Navy Environmental Health Center
Officer in Charge, Naval Education & Training Information Systems Activity, Memphis Detachment
Human Goals Office, Naval Education & Training Center, Newport
Technical Training Division, AF Human Resource Laboratory, Lowry AFB
Flying Training Division, AF Human Resources Laboratory, Williams AFB
Advanced Systems Division, AF Human Resources Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB

Technical Library, AF Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Lackland AFB
Personnel Research Division, AF Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Lackland AFB (2)
Program Manager, Life Sciences Directorate, AF Office of Scientific Research, (AFSC), Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.
Human Resources Development Division, U.S. Army Personnel & Administration Combat Developments Activity
Director, Defense Documentation Center (ATTN: DDC TC) (12)
Defense Race Relations Institute
Secretary Treasurer, U.S. Naval Institute